ing up near thg city o'f Jammu during the last three years;

(b) th$_e$ number of authorised/un-authorised colonies, separately, and authorised colonies, separately an/i who are the promoters thereof;

(c) whether it is a fact that the land used by the colonisers also includes State/Forest Land;

(d) whether the above land also includes the area to which Town Planning Act/Development Act and Grants Act apply;

(e) what is the rate at which the colonisers are selling various types of plots; and

(f) whether Government have taken or proposed t$_0$ tak$_e$ any effectiAve steps to check the growth of unautho rised or unplanned colonies?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARUNACHALAM (a) to (f) Urban Development is a State subject and the responsibility in regard to giving permissions for colonies under the respective Town Planning Act or taking action against unauthorised colonies is that of the State Government and the local body or development authority concerned. Hence the Government of India is not collecting any data in this regard with reference to specific cities in any State.

Acquisition of Government Land by Amb$_e$dkar Bhavan, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi

3420. SHRI SATCHIDANANDA: WiU the Minister URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased t$_0$ state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Ambed kar Bhawan, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi has unauthorisedly acquired Government land;

(b) whether it is a fact that this land has been given to a private ca terer by taking lakhs of rupees;

(c) whether this caterer i$_s$ doing the business of catering on the pre* mises of this building; and

(d) if so, the action taken by Government to take back the land whicl is in unauthorised possession of *the* Ambedkar Bhawan and to stop th< catering business from the premises?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT) (SHRIM. ARUNACHALAM):

(a) A plot of land measuring *1M* acres in Rani Jhansi Road (known as Ambedkar Bhawan) was allotted t< Delhi Scheduled Caste Welfare Association in July, 1946. The institution hats unauthorisedly occupied ai area of around 15500 sq. Mtr. adjacen to this plot. The request of the insti tution for allotment of this is beini examined.

(b) and (c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise in view of *(b* and (c) above.

Acquisition of land for developmon of Delhi

3421. SHRI SHIVPRASAD CHAN PURI A: Will the Minister of URBA] DEVELOPMENT be pleased t$_0$ state

(a) whether the persons whose Ian of 1 bigha is acquired for planne development of Delhi are entitled 1 plot-size of 40 sq. yard$_s$ under th scheme of large scal$_e$ acquisition deve lopment and disposal of land, 1961, *so,* since when this decision is i vogue;

(b) whether the decision of plot-sia of 40 Sq. yards in cases acquisitic of land of 1 bigha applicable in cas prior to 1991, if so, what is the rs tionals for retrospective application < this decision; and

(c) whether the persons whose Ian of 1 bigha was acquired and were al lotted plot-size measuring of 250 sc yards a$_s$ par their original recommec

dation, can be given the plot of 40 sq. yards in its places, if so, what arte the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) As per clarification issued by the Delhi Admn. in November, 1990, •» persons whose lands measuring exactly one bigha were acquired and in respect of which awards were announced prior to 3-4-1986 are eligible for 40 sq. yards plot.

(c) Prior to 15-11-1990, in some cases by a wrong interpretation of the orders, Delhi Administration had recommended 250 sq. yards erroneously in case of land acquired measured one bigha. The correct position was clarified on 15-11-1990. In respect of cases where 250 sq. yards plots were wrongly recommended no final decision has been taken by the Delhi Administration.

Rohini Residential Scheme

3422. SHRI SHIV PRASAD CHANPURIA: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) thei number of changes for location of plots were made from Rohini Residential Scheme to other fully developed schemes of North Zone during January, 1989 to June, 1992;

(b) what are the grounds for which changes were allowed;

(c) the number of allottees still requesting for change from Rohini Residential Scheme to other developed colonies of North Zone;

(d) the requests of such allottees of Rithala Village in Rohini were considered but not acceded to; and

(e) what are the reasons for not allowing change of requests affected Rithala Villagers to other developed Schemes of North Zone?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) DDA have reported that in 14 cases changes were allowed during the period January 1989 to June 1992 for reasons such as;

(i) Plot allotted was a irregular size.

(ii) Plot allotted is not fully developed.

(iii) Existance of grave yard etc. at the site.

(c) In 9 cases allottees, are still requesting for change from Rohini residential scheme to other developed pockets of North Zone.

(d) and (e) Two cases of requests for change of allottees residing in Rithala Village from Rohini to other pockets of North Zone were not agreed to earlier. However, their subsequent requests for change are again under examination.

Construction of road in Mandawali Fazalpur, Delhi

3423. SHRI SHANTI TYAGI; Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that huge amount was spent to construct a 100 feet wide road from the Railway crossing to the Railway Colony, Mandawali Fazalpur, Delhi but only a stretch of 500 yards was constructed;

(b) if so, what measures have been taken to complete the road, during the last five years;

(c) whether it is a fact that there is no link road to connect the Railway Colony to any motorable road in its vicinity;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the drains in the colony remain blocked with filth and dirty water and fear of outbreak of epidemic looms large at all times but the colony is declared an urbanised regularised colony; and